

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The drawings have been amended to include specific reference to component number 27, the connection spigot, as recommended by the Examiner in ¶ 2 of the Office Action. Specifically, FIGS. 2, 3 and 9 have been amended to include component number 27. Clean replacement sheets for FIGS. 2, 3 and 9 are included in Appendix C, and annotated drawing sheets showing the deletion of component 27 in FIGS. 2, 3, and 9 are included in Appendix D.

Appendix: C) Replacement Drawing Sheets
 D) Annotated Drawing Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are in the Application. In response to the issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed on September 14, 2006, Applicant has corrected typographical errors in the specification, amended independent Claim 1, added new independent Claim 22, and submitted replacement drawing sheets for FIGS. 2, 3 and 9.

More particularly, the following changes have been made to the Specification: 1) section headings have been added (in response to ¶ 3.a of the Office Action); 2) the definite article “an” was added to Page 2, Line 15, which is now at Page 1, Line 28, in the Replacement Specification (in response to ¶ 3.b of the Office Action); 3) “end plates 18” was added to replace “end plates 19” at Page 8, Line 14, which is now at Page 5, Line 12, in the Replacement Specification (in response to ¶ 3.c of the Office Action); 4) “FIG. 15” was added to replace “FIG. 13” at Page 10, Line 13, which is now at Page 6, Line 13, in the Replacement Specification (in response to ¶ 3.d of the Office Action); 5) an indentation was added at Page 10, Line 14, which is now at Page 6, Line 14, in the Replacement Specification (in response to ¶ 3.e of the Office Action); and 6) other grammatical errors have been corrected throughout the specification consistent with Examiner’s request.

In regard to the Claims, Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that the longitudinal side edges “form or define the open bottom” of the reflector housing. Claim 22 has been newly added and finds support in the specification at Page 4, Lines 9-22; Page 11, Lines 20-23; and Page 10, Lines 6-13, of the originally-submitted specification and corresponding Pages 2-3, Lines 33-35 and 1-7, respectively; Page 6, Lines 34-36; and Page 6, Lines 8-14, of the replacement specification.

Also, the drawings have been amended and replacement sheets included to specifically reference component number 27, *ie.*, the connection spigot, as required by the Examiner in ¶ 2 of the Office Action.

Applicant has considered all of the issues raised by the Examiner, and respectfully submits that, in view of the above-referenced amendments and the following remarks, Claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 15-16, and 18-21

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 9-10, 15-16, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U S Patent No. 3,090,434 to Benson, Jr. ("the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent"). However, Applicant respectfully submits that the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent does not disclose all of the elements recited in independent Claim 1, and therefore does not anticipate Claim 1, nor Claims 2-7, 9-10, 15-16 and 18-21, which depend therefrom.

More particularly, the Examiner asserts that structures 19 and 20 of the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent correspond to and disclose the longitudinal side edges of Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that reference numerals 19 and 20 of the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent are not longitudinal side edges. Rather, they are downwardly extending side walls. Because they are sidewalls, neither of those structures disclose the longitudinal side edges of Applicant's invention. None of the structures in the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent that define or form the open bottom of each reflector housing support or are releasably attached to a bridging plate or intermediate housing so as to disclose the longitudinal side edges of Applicant's invention as recited in Claim 1.

The Examiner also asserts that structures 28, 29, 29a, 93 and/or 97 of the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent, shown in FIGS. 2 and 2A of the Patent, disclose a bridging plate or intermediate housing. Applicant respectfully submits, however, there is no equivalent of a bridging plate or intermediate housing disclosed in the Benson, Jr. '343 Patent. Rather, structure 28 of the Patent is a circular opening in wall 18. Structure 93 of the Patent is a flanged collar and structure 97 of the Patent is a conduit, neither of which are relevant to the bridging plate or intermediate housing of Applicant's invention. Structures 29 and 29a of the Patent are inlet chambers and also do not appear to be relevant. Walls 27 and 27a of the Patent, which define inlet chamber 29, do not releasably attach or support adjoining longitudinal side edges of a reflector housing, nor do they form or define the open bottom of each reflector housing, as recited in Claim 1 of Applicant's invention.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention disclosed in the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent is extremely complex and would be expensive to manufacture. Applicant's invention, in stark contrast, is a very simplified structure compared to the structure disclosed in the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent.

As to Claim 2, in addition to the argument set forth above for Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the recited plenum is not disclosed by structure 29a. More particularly, as pointed out above, chamber 29a in the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent is not supported by or releasably attached to adjoining longitudinal edges of the reflector housing. Instead, wall 27 of 29a is supported by v-shaped longitudinal formations of each reflector 17.

As to Claim 3, and in addition to the argument set forth above for Claims 1 and 2, Applicant respectfully submits that the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent does not disclose a connection spigot 27, as recited. The subject matter of Claim 3 is shown FIG. 3 of the instant application,

and shows the intermediate housing having a connection spigot 27 extending laterally of a longitudinal axis of the intermediate housing. Applicant respectfully submits that this structure is not shown in the Benson, Jr. '343 Patent. Spigot 90 appears to surround the longitudinal axis of chamber 29, and therefore does not disclose the connection spigot of Applicant's invention, as recited in Claim 3.

As to Claim 5, and in addition to the arguments set forth above for Claims 1 and 2, Applicant respectfully submits that the Benson, Jr. '343 Patent has no structure corresponding to the lower side walls, which then form a top wall of the housing, as recited. Specifically, chamber 29 of the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent does not have a top wall, as shown in FIGS. 2 and 2A of the Patent.

Claims 4, 6-7, 9-10, 15-16, and 18-21 all depend directly or indirectly from allowable Claims 1-3 and 5 set forth above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 4, 6-7, 9-10, 15-16, and 18-21 are also in condition for allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 8

The Examiner has rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references must teach or suggest all of the limitations of a claim to render the claim obvious, and that as set forth above, the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent does not teach or suggest the limitations recited in Claims 1-3, all of which form a basis, either directly or indirectly, for Claim 8. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 8 is also in condition for allowance.

Claims 11-14 and 17

The Examiner has rejected Claims 11-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Benson, Jr '434 Patent, as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,443,592 to Unger et al ("the Unger '592 Patent").

Claims 11-14 and 17 all depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that, as set forth above, the Benson, Jr '434 Patent does not teach or suggest the limitations recited in Claim 1, because it fails to disclose at least a bridging plate and/or longitudinal side edges as recited in Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Unger '592 Patent also fails to teach or suggest at least these limitations as recited in Claim 1. Because Claims 11-14 and 17 all depend directly or indirectly from allowable Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that they, too, are in condition for allowance.

NEW CLAIM 22

Applicant has added new Claim 22, which recites the formation of a modular system of each light fitting and the bridging plate or intermediate housing, which are all separate units or separate integral structures releasably attached to each other. Applicant respectfully submits that the elements recited in Claim 22 are not taught or suggested, alone or in combination, by the Benson, Jr. '434 Patent and/or the Unger '592 Patent, and the Claim, therefore, is allowable.

In view of the above, it is submitted that Claims 1-22 remaining in the application now are in condition for allowance, and reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested and

Appl No. 10/500,695
Amdt. Dated December 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 14, 2006

allowance of the claims at an early date is hereby respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCKINGHAM, DOOLITTLE & BURROUGHS, LLP



By: Brent L. Moore, Registration No. 42,902
David P. Dureska, Registration No. 34,152

BLM/cam

4518 Fulton Drive, N W.
P. O. Box 35548
Canton, OH 44735-5548
Telephone: (330) 491-5333
Facsimile: (330) 252-5376
E-Mail: Bmoore@bdblawn.com
Attorney Docket No.: FISHER-B (51373 0010)

«CI2:521347_v1»